

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/715,350

Applicant(s)

MONTGOMERY, DAVID

Examiner

Michael J. Simitoski

Art Unit

2134

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael J. Simitoski.

(3) _____.

(2) Christopher Reckamp.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 May 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 26 and 42-44.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner contacted Applicant regarding the previous §101 rejection on claims 26 & 42-44. Applicant amended the specification in the response filed 3/19/2007 to limit the previously-recited "software applications" to "executing software applications" regarding the "signed certificate set generator". As execution of a software application requires some hardware, the "signed certificate set generator" falls within one of the four statutory classes of invention as defined in 35 U.S.C. §101. As such, all claims in the application, as per the response of 3/19/2007, are statutory, where the "signed certificate set generator" is defined at least on p. 11 of the specification.